

Appl. No. 10/007,375  
Amdt. dated August 7, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of May 7, 2003

### Remarks

By the above amendment Applicants have corrected an inadvertent error in the specification. The error is apparent when considering the associated Range, Minimum, Maximum and Standard Deviation numbers which could not result in an average of 1.09. The correct number is evidenced by Applicants' provisional application upon which this case is based where it is correctly reported on page 12. Therefore, no issue of new matter is presented by this correction.

Also, the above amendment addresses issues raised by the Examiner under 35USC112 with respect to claim 12. As amended, claim 12 is believed to satisfy the 35USC112 requirements by particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming Applicants' invention.

Applicants affirm the election of claims 12 and 13 pursuant to the Examiner's restriction requirement made by telephone on 25-Mar-03. This election is made without traverse. Claims 1 and 4 have been deleted and the remaining claims amended consistent with this election so as to be examined with claims 12 and 13.

With respect to the rejection based on 35USC112, second paragraph, the confusion helpfully identified by the Examiner has been alleviated by amending claim 12 to state that it is for a process of producing the treated web. This is believed consistent with the construction of the claim used by the Examiner as the basis for examining the claims. The term "good" has, by the above amendment, been clarified by identifying the alcohol repellency rating as supported by page 3, line 5 of Applicants' specification. As amended, Applicants' claims are believed to satisfy the requirements of 35USC112, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 13 as filed stand rejected under 35USC103(a) as unpatentable over Coates USP 4,382,990 ("990") in view of Coates USP 4,082,887 ("887"). The rejection contends that the '990 patent teaches Applicants' claimed invention of claim 12 except for the property of alcohol repellency and that the '887 compositions have alcohol repellent properties and would be obvious to use in the process of '990. Applicants respectfully disagree because the proposed combination lacks any suggestion that would lead one of skill in the art to the specific two step process of claim 12 resulting in the two sided properties as claimed herein. More importantly, however, Applicants have amended claim 12 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim their invention by specifying that both treatment steps contain an antistatic agent and produce one side rich in antistatic agent and one side with minimal antistatic agent. Neither the '990 patent alone or in combination with the '887 patent

Received from < 770 587 7327 > at 8/7/03 12:59:09 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

OFFICIAL

Appl. N . 10/007,375  
Amdt. dated August 7, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of May 7, 2003


would, Applicants submit, lead one skilled in the art to use a two step process as now claimed with both steps including an antistatic agent treatment. Applicants' Example 1 demonstrates particularly improved results obtained with this embodiment and supports unobviousness. Claim 13 is believed patentable over the applied references for all the same reasons and further because the '990 reference merely discusses curing of the binder in the coating. It is important to appreciate that the coating compositions of the '990 patent are high solids and contain a molten mixture into which is dispersed polytetrafluoroethylene particles as distinguished from the aqueous compositions of the process of the invention. See '990, col. 6, li. 20-39. In fact, the '990 patent discourages antistatic agent addition to its coating composition as detrimental to dispersion in its binder compositions. See '990, col. 5, li. 3-5. A separate antistatic agent addition step is preferred, if an antistat is used at all. See '990, col. 6, li. 40-54. Taken as a whole, it is respectfully submitted that the applied references teach away from Applicants' invention, particularly as now claimed. Accordingly, allowance of claims 12 and 13 as amended and claims dependent thereon is believed to be in order, and such favorable action is respectfully solicited.

The undersigned may be reached at 770-587-8096.

Respectfully submitted,

Hue S. Snowden et al.

By:



William D. Herrick  
Registration No.: 25,468  
Tel.: 770-587-8096